



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/645,690	08/24/2000	Lizhong Sun	4215/PDD/CMP/RKK	4428
44257	7590	01/09/2006	EXAMINER	
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP			MARKOFF, ALEXANDER	
3040 POST OAK BOULEVARD, SUITE 1500				
HOUSTON, TX 77056			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1746	

DATE MAILED: 01/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

W

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/645,690	SUN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Alexander Markoff	1746	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 21 December 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
 12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
 13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

ALEXANDER MARKOFF  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Alexander Markoff  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 1746

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicants rely on the Declaration filed under 37 CFR 1.131. The Declaration, however, is not sufficient to overcome the rejection. See the attached Note for the detailed explanation. It is noted that the deficiencies of the Declaration were previously discussed in the final Office action. It is noted that the applicants failed to correct the referenced deficiencies. The applicants merely refilled a previously filed copy of the Declaration .

1. The Declaration filed on 12/21/05 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Small et al reference because of the following:
2. The applicants refilled a copy of the Declaration, which was the previously filed and discussed in the final Office action.
3. It is noted that this time the applicants provided Exhibit A referenced in the Declaration.
4. However, the applicants failed to correct the deficiencies of the Declaration explicitly discussed in the final Office action.
5. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Small et al reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897). The evidence submitted is not commensurate in scope with the pending claims at least because of the absence of the recitation of the concentrations and PH of the composition used in the claimed method. Moreover, there is no evidence submitted to support basic pH range and the use of bases to obtain such pH.
6. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the Small et al reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice.

Art Unit: 1746

7. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a reduction to practice of the invention in this country or a NAFTA or WTO member country prior to the effective date of the Small et al reference.

8. The following formal deficiencies are also noted:

9. The Declaration is not signed by all inventors and there is no explanation provided for missing signatures.

10. It is also noted that the Declaration states (paragraph 4, lines 2-3) that the invention of pending claims was conceived prior to August 7, 2000 and filed prior to August 7, 2000. This statement is not correct because the instant invention was not filed prior to the referenced date.